

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

SEP 15 2006

REMARKS

Claims 1-25 have been rejected. Independent claims 1, 4 and 15 have been amended, leaving claims 1-25 for consideration upon entry thereof. It is believed that such amendment places the application in condition for allowance. Support for the amendment can be found at least at page 11, paragraph [0038] and page 13, paragraph [0045] of the specification as originally filed. No new matter has been added.

Claim Rejections - § 102

Claims 1-3, 4-9 and 12 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by McMahon (U.S. Patent No. 5,903,432). The Examiner alleges that Figure 2 of McMahon teaches all elements of the above-mentioned claims. Applicants respectfully traverse.

To anticipate a claim under 35 U.S.C. § 102, a single source must contain all of the elements of the claim. *Lewmar Marine Inc. v. Barient, Inc.*, 827 F.2d 744, 747, 3 U.S.P.Q.2d 1766, 1768 (Fed. Cir. 1987), *cert. denied*, 484 U.S. 1007 (1988). Moreover, the single source must disclose all of the claimed elements "arranged as in the claim." (Emphasis added.) *Structural Rubber Prods. Co. v. Park Rubber Co.*, 749 F.2d 707, 716, 223 U.S.P.Q. 1264, 1271 (Fed. Cir. 1984).

It is respectfully submitted that Figure 2 of McMahon upon which the Examiner relies teaches guide rails 28 attached to the power/ground busses 18 of the motherboard 14. One guide rail 28 may be dedicated to electrical power while the other rail 28 is dedicated to electrical ground. The guide rails 28 engage corresponding conductive strips 30 of the electronic substrates 12 when the substrates 12 are plugged into the connectors 20. The conductive strips 30 are coupled to the power/ground busses (not shown) of the substrates 12. The guide rails 28 provide a robust power/ground connector which has a relatively low impedance. (Col. 2, lines 23-35). Thus, McMahon discloses electrically conductive rails 28 that provide power to the conductive strips throughout entire slidable engagement therewith (e.g., complete entire length of translation therewith) and not only upon full insertion or being fully plugged in.

Further, it is respectfully submitted that McMahon discloses the conductive strips 30

IB1-0068
POU920030127US1

defining the thickness or profile width of each daughter, thus teaching away from an advantage of the present invention (i.e., reducing a thickness of the card 16, see page 10, paragraph [0037]).

More specifically, McMahon does not teach or suggest, and in fact teaches away from, said daughter card having a power tab extending beyond a first edge defining a periphery of said daughter card and a signal connector extending from a second edge perpendicular to said first edge, said signal connector configured to connect to said mother card for signal interconnection therebetween; and a guide means for guiding said daughter card into said mother card cage and in signal interconnection therewith, said guide means configured to provide power into and out of said daughter card via connection with said power tab only when said daughter card is substantially fully received within said cage, wherein said power tab directly interfaces with said guide means guiding said daughter card into said cage, as in amended claim 1, and similarly claimed in independent claims 4 and 15.

Moreover, since McMahon teaches electrically conductive rails 28, McMahon does not teach or suggest, and in fact teaches away from, said at least one guide rail being formed of an insulative material and having a power receptacle disposed within said at least one rail, said receptacle configured to operably provide power interconnection between said tab and said power supply only when said each daughter card is substantially fully plugged into said cage, as in amended claim 15.

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that claims 1, 4 and 15, including claims depending therefrom, i.e., claims 2, 3, 5-14 and 16-25, define over McMahon for at least this reason. Therefore it is respectfully requested that the rejection thereto be withdrawn.

Claim Rejections - § 103

Claims 10, 11, 21 and 22 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over McMahon. Applicants respectfully traverse.

The Examiner alleges that McMahon teaches all of the elements of the above-mentioned claims except (1) that the receptacle including a power connection fork louver configured to receive two sides defining said tab and electrically coupled to said corresponding bus; and (2) that the power supply is disposed in the cage, which the Examiner

IB1-0068
POU920030127US1

states would have been obvious.

First, it is respectfully noted that claims 10 and 11 depend from independent claim 4, while claims 21 and 22 depend from independent claim 15, both of which are submitted as being allowable for defining over McMahon as discussed above. Secondly, it is respectfully noted that use of power fork louver type connections and power supplies within the cage do not cure the deficiencies noted above with respect to McMahon in view of the independent claims 4 and 15.

Therefore, it is respectfully requested that the rejection to claims 10, 11, 21 and 22 be withdrawn and allow the same to issue.

Claims 14 and 25 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over McMahon in view of Otis (U.S. Patent No. 6,487,089). Applicants respectfully traverse.

The Examiner alleges that McMahon teach all of the elements of the above-mentioned claims except that said daughter card includes a reworkable EMC tailstock opposite said signal connector, which the Examiner alleges is taught in Otis at column 1, lines 40-45; and in Figure 8, element 44.


First, it is respectfully noted that claims 14 depends from independent claim 4, while claim 25 depends from independent claim 15, both of which are submitted as being allowable for defining over McMahon as discussed above. Secondly, it is respectfully noted that use of a reworkable EMC tailstock opposite said signal connector of a daughter card does not cure the deficiencies noted above with respect to McMahon.

Therefore, it is respectfully requested that the rejection to claims 14 and 25 be withdrawn and allow the same to issue.

It is believed that the foregoing remarks are fully responsive to the Office Action and that the claims herein should be allowable to the Applicants. In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully request the withdrawal of all rejections made by the Examiner and the allowance of all of the claims. In the event the Examiner has any queries regarding the instantly submitted Amendment, the undersigned respectfully requests the courtesy of a telephone conference to discuss any matters in need of attention.

If there are any additional charges with respect to this Amendment or otherwise, please charge them to Deposit Account No. 09-0463.

Respectfully submitted,

By 
James J. Merrick
Registration No. 43,801
CANTOR COLBURN LLP
55 Griffin Road South
Bloomfield, CT 06002
Telephone (860) 286-2929
Facsimile (860) 286-0115
Customer No. 46429

Date: September 15, 2006